

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addease COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.webjo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/533,473	04/29/2005	Carlos F. Fuente	GB920020085US1	4063
46335 DILLON & YU	7590 10/10/2008 IDELL LLP	EXAMINER		
8911 N CAPITAL OF TEXAS HWY			LOONAN, ERIC T	
SUITE 2110 AUSTIN, TX 7	8759		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2189	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Ī	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/533,473	FUENTE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	EDIO I GOVIANI	2189	
	ERIC LOONAN	2109	

	ERIC LOONAN	2189						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address								
THE REPLY FILED 06 October 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.						
application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Application for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C	The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time							
periods: a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is I no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.								
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1,136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1,136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1,17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set for thin (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office lates than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filled, may reduce any semed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1,704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL								
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extel Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed was considered.	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	s of the date of appeal. Since a					
AMENDMENTS	ithin the time period set forth in 37 v	CFR 41.37(a).						
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, I			cause					
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co		E below);						
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or 								
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.						
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	N. C	-F1 •110	DTOL OOA					
 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) 		mpliant Amendment (i	PTOL-324).					
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cano non-allowable claim(s). 								
For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided.		be entered and an e	xplanation of					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	nada bolon of appoinada.							
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:								
Claim(s) rejected:								
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:								
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	thefree season the date of Cross - No.							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome all rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a					
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.					
The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:					
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). 13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)							
/Reginald G. Bragdon/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2189								

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

With respect to applicant's remarks, the examiner maintains that the prior art of record teaches an instance of a system with only one primary system 12 and only one backup system 14. The examiner maintains that the primary system 12 read syon applicant's claimed owner node and the backup system 14 reads upon applicant's client node. The examiner reiterates Col 8, Lines 4-6 of the prior art which states "The system ... comprises one or more primary systems 12".

The applicant argues that the Examiner overlooks Figure 1's depiction of two primary systems. The Examiner does not rely on Figure 1's system level depiction of an instance of the system (with two primary systems 12) to reject the claim. The Examiner retutes Applicant's notion that the prior art of record only discloses an computing environment having two primary systems 12 and one backup systems 14.